II.   AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATIONS

Please accept amendments to page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 18 as follows:

If, for example, the automotive dealer trading partner 30 desired to exchange a customer's automobile information with an automotive lending provider trading partner 38, the department of motor vehicles 36 and an insurance provider trading partner 34, the dealer 30 could do so from a single terminal or interface. In the past, the dealer 30 was forced to use a different terminal or application for each trading partner, or adapt their existing computer system to communicate in the schema and protocol of each different trading partner. Moreover, the dealer may be forced to perform multiple manual tasks to complete the transaction. With respect to schema, ~~both~~ data content, data format and application format should be considered. For data format, one trading partner may communicate automobile information as "Chevrolet, Blazer, 1999" while another trading partner may communicate the same information as "Blazer, Chevy, 99." For data content, a system needs to interpret, for example, "Chevy" as the same as "Chevrolet." As generally understood, "Chevy" or "Chevrolet" is the substantive content of the data, not its format. For application format, two trading partners may utilize different software applications in their operation (e.g., M.S. Word™ vs. Corel WordPerfect™). Conversion between the software applications could corrupt the data. With respect to communication protocols, different protocols could include, among others, SOAP/XML, ODBC/JDBC, MQ, HTTP/XML, COM/COM+, RPC, CORBA/IIOP, OTMA, and WAP. Accordingly, due to the quantity of various combinations that exist, adapting to or adopting every schema and protocol is both expensive and time consuming.